REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the final Office Action mailed September 23, 2008. Claims 1-32, 35-40 and 43-45 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. The present response amends claims 1, 4, 13, 15, 22, 23, 25, 30, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40 and 43, and cancels claim 44. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

I.   Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

In the Office Action mailed September 23, 2008, the Examiner rejects claims 1-32, 35-40 and 43-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Desai Arpan (December 3-14, 2001) in view of Lock et al. U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0028212 and further in view of Wang et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,062,507.

Claim 43

Based on the brief discussion over the phone between the Examiner To, Baoquoc N. and Patent Agent Kuiran (Ted) Liu (#60,039) on November 19, 2008, Claim 43 defines a feature of "*parsing an XML document to generate a stream of discrete pieces of the XML document*; ... *performing a match on said discrete piece of the XML document from the stream ... listening for the matched discrete piece of the XML document and passing it to a first user object; returning said discrete piece of the XML document to the stream; and pulling said discrete piece of the XML document from the stream for the use of a subsequent user object, wherein the subsequent user object handles said discrete piece of the XML document when there is another match.*"

As stated in the pending Office Action, Desai does not teach returning said discrete piece of the XML document to the stream and pulling said discrete piece of the XML document from the stream for the use of a subsequent user object.

Furthermore, the Examiner cited Wang (Col. 3, Lines 32-36), which discloses inserting at least one XML document form a data source in to an XML parser; providing a matcher to receive at least one event from the XML parser and to deliver the matched profile ids to the profile and user manager. However, neither the event nor the profile ids in Wang is a discrete piece of the XML document as in Claim 43.

Applicant respectfully submits that Desai, Wang and other cited arts do not teach the above feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 43 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 1

Claim 1 defines a feature of *"maintaining a plurality of contexts associated with said discrete piece of the XML document; performing a match against each of the plurality of contexts on said discrete piece of the XML document from the stream."* Applicant respectfully submits that Desai and other cited arts do not teach such a feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 13 and 23

Claims 13 and 23, while independently patentable, recites limitations that, similarly to those described above with respect to Claim 1, are not taught, suggested nor otherwise rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-12, 14-22, 24-32, and 35-40

Claims 2-12, 14-22, 24-32, and 35-40 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-12, 14-22, 24-32, and 35-40 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claims 45

Claim 45 is not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 45 is similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own

right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

II.   Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 21, 2008   By: _____ /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/ _____
                                                            Kuiran (Ted) Liu
                                                            Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, Fourteenth Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800